DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 062 PS 018 016

AUTHOR Sheerer, Marilyn A.
TITLE An Ethnographic Investigation of Chauncey Elementary School.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-April 1, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Administrator Role; Classroom Research; Educational Anthropology; Educational Improvement; Elementary Education; *Elementary Schools; Ethnography; Excellence in Education; Holistic Approach; Open Education; *Organizational Climate; Parent Attitudes; *Participative Decision Making; Principals; School Administration; School Community Relationship; *School Effectiveness; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS Organizational Research

ABSTRACT

An ethnographic investigation of interrelationships between teacher efficacy attitudes, teacher behavior, students' performance, and organizational climate in a total school setting was conducted at Chauncey Elementary School in Athens, Ohio. Chauncey was studied because its teachers had begun to implement an open classroom model which promoted a democratic decision-making process; had taken a position against the Athens City School District regarding the purchase of basal readers; and were actively advocating a literature-based reading program for primary grades. Questions guiding the inquiry included: (1) What was going on at Chauncy that supported innovative activity by teachers? (2) What kind of climate and organizational framework encouraged the innovative classroom activity? (3) What effect did the pattern of instruction and organizational control have on the teachers' sense of effectiveness and performance in class? (4) How was it that these particular teachers were working to bring about change? (5) Did these teachers differ significantly in socioeconcomic terms from their colleagues in more traditional schools, or from the parents of the Chauncey children? and (6) What were the social relations among teachers, administrators, and students? Results concerning educational innovation are discussed. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED307062

An Ethnographic Investigation of Chauncey Elementary School

Marilyn A. Sheerer, Ph.D.

National College of Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marilyn A. Sheerer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

115 West Royal Drive
DeKalb, Illinois 60115
815-758-8748

PS 018016

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Criticisms of the American public school system have abounded over the past 40 years. There has been, and continues to be, widespread dissatisfaction with schooling in the United States. In the 1950's, the criticism centered on the curriculum and on the competence of those who staff schools - - especially administrators, teachers and those who train teachers. Why Johnny Can't Read(1955), Crisis in Education(1949), Educational Wastelands (1955), and Education and Freedom(1959) emphasized certain basic problems: low reading and math skills of students; inability of students to think logically and independently; and inadequate intellectual preparation of students. In the aftermath of Russia's successful launching of Sputnik, reformers called for a return to the "fundamentals" in education and a renewed emphasis on high standards, particularly in science and math, along with more rigorous teacher training programs and scholarly preparation for administrators.

During the 1960's, a time of intense unrest on college campuses, the schools responded by embracing a more humanistic curriculum that sought social relevance. School and society were in a reactive position. But in the 1970's, the attacks on the schools continued, spearheaded by Charles Silberman's Crisis in the Classroom (1970). And with the 1980's came a new barage of reports - - "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform" (1983); "The Paideia Proposal: An Educa-

tional Manifesto" (1982); "Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve our Nation's Schools" (1983); and "Academic Preparation for College" (1983).

The general nature of these proposals is to urge correction and improvement. In "A Nation at Risk," the most frequently cited report, the problems identified include the lower achievement test scores of American students versus student scores in other countries; the functional illiteracy of 33 million adults and 13 percent of all 17-year olds; the fact that gifted students do not match their tested ability with comparable achievement in school; and the decline in SAT scores. Recommendations emphasize strengthening the curriculum, teaching of higher order skills such as problem solving and inductive reasoning, and upgrading teacher training and increasing pay. The focus of most of these reports is on teachers - - their preparation, their performance, status and salaries. Reforms called for are teacher competency tests, performance-based salaries, 11-month contracts and career ladders.

The reforms proposed in these reports are piecemeal and inadequately focused. Indeed, few clearly defined specific strategies have been suggested. Overall, we still seem to lack a clear diagnosis of the problems of our schools. Parts of the school system continue to be analyzed in isolation; there have been thousands of studies of the various pieces, most of them seeking to determine the effects of some classroom practice on student achievement. Researchers criticize schools but tend to study students, teachers or methods of teaching separately.

Recommendations are vague, inconclusive and disconnected.

Alternative Research Strategies

Several of the more recent studies, however, take a different approach. John Goodlad (1984) agrees that American schools are in trouble, but believes that we are still ignorant of the ways in which they function and, therefore, cannot effect real change in the system. Goodlad recommends a more holistic approach:

> Significant educational improvement of schooling, not mere tinkering, requires that we focus on entire schools, not just teachers or principals or curricula or organization or school-community relations, but all of these and more . . . it is advisable to focus on one place where all of the elements come together - the individual school. If we are to improve it, we must understand it.
>
> (P. XVI)

In his research, Goodlad sought information from within a select number of schools and from all the participants - - students, teachers, parents and principals. One of the major messages of his report is that improvement is essentially a school-by-school process, shaped by the degree to which those associated with the school have the data required for building a useful agenda.

Goodlad also focused on teachers, but from an inside perspective. He describes the isolation of teachers and their

lack of involvement in decision making. His analysis looks at the interrelationship of student learning and teachers' feelings of efficacy within the organizational framework.

Several other researchers have agreed with Goodlad's approach. Ernest Boyer's High School (1983) is a report based on the direct observational study of 15 schools for at least 20 days. Like Goodlad, he looks at teachers within these constrained environments and identifies their lack of control over many factors critical to instruction. According to Boyer, the whole context needs to be considered in trying to improve teaching or raise standards in education.

Theodore R. Sizer's Horace's Compromise (1984) represents a 2-year journey to high schools throughout America. He portrays institutions whose goals have become contradictory, whose methods are bogged down in bureaucracy and where inspired teachers like Horace Smith are misused and demoralized. As with Goodlad and Boyer, Sizer's approach is more holistic; he looks at teachers within the systems in which they are functioning to identify problems and offer solutions.

Recent research by Ashton and Webb of the University of Florida (1986) supports an ethnographic framework for studying teachers within schools. They focus specifically on teacher motivation as the single greatest impediment to school improvement. Through observations, interviews and questionnaires, they document the feelings of powerlessness that envelope teachers after a period of time in the workplace. However, these authors also document the lives of teachers high in

feelings of personal power and self-efficacy; and they examine the organizational climate that fosters those feelings.

The Carnegie Foundation's celebrated 1986 report also focuses primarily on the dilemma of teachers in our schools. Teachers are described as immensely frustrated as they watch the bureaucratic structure within which they work becoming even more rigid and the opportunities for exercising professional judgment more limited. The recommendations of this task force on teaching define a framework that implies a transformation of the environment for teaching. After reviewing the many proposals for reform, task force members call for a restructuring of the teaching force and its organizational context.

> School systems based on bureaucratic authority must be replaced by schools in which authority is grounded in the professional competence of the teacher and where teachers work together as colleagues, constantly striving to improve their performance.
>
> (p. 47)

Present Study

Unfortunately, there has been very little research on the interrelationship of teacher efficacy attitudes, teacher behavior, students' performance and organizational climate within the total school setting. The present study sought to address this gap in the literature through an investigation of one elementary school - Chauncey Elementary School - in the

Athens City School District, Athens, Ohio. I purposely chose an ethnographic perspective on the subject, since it provided a framework in which the total school environment could be observed and interpreted.

The school itself is in the town of Chauncey (population 1,000) which is located five miles west of Athens, Ohio. This particular region of Ohio is culturally similar to rural West Virginia and is sometimes included in the Appalachian area by sociologists. The majority of Chauncey residents are working class people. Many of them were employed in the coal mines, prior to the closing of those enterprises. At present, the unemployment rate is high; a high percentage of the community is receiving assistance through the county welfare department.

Selection of this particular school was made because of the researcher's awareness of particular program innovations at Chauncey. Unlike the traditional framework adhered to by the other four elementary schools in the district, Chauncey appeared to be a site where new things were being tried and teachers were directly involved in the design and implementation of thse innovations. In the primary wing, several teachers had begun to implement an open classroom model which promoted a more democratic decision-making process. These same teachers were actively advocating a literature-based reading program for the primary grades and had taken a position against the district with regard to the purchase of basal readers.

Chauncey teachers had also initiated contacts with the

College of Education at Ohio University to explore theoretical frameworks for their open education models and had been instrumental in helping to form an Institute through the College which conducts seminars and workshops on democratic alternatives in education. This same group of teachers secured two grants - one to provide training in conflict management in the classroom and one to allow for peer observation in classrooms across the district.

Certain questions guided the ethnographic inquiry into this one elementary school and its staff. What was going on at Chauncey that promoted and supported this kind of activity on the part of teachers? What kind of climate and organizational framework encouraged the innovative classroom activity? What effect did this pattern of instruction and organizational control have on these teachers' sense of effectiveness and on their actual performance in the classroom? How was it that these particular teachers were working to bring about change? Did these teachers differ significantly in socio-economic terms from their colleagues in other, more traditional schools, or from the parents of the Chauncey children? What were the social relations among teachers, administrators and students?

Methodology

The basic approach utilized in this study was that of participant-observational fieldwork. According to Erickson (1984), this research involves intensive, long-term participation in a field setting; careful recording of what happens in the setting by writing field notes and collecting other

kinds of documentary evidence; subsequent analytic reflection on the documentary record obtained in the field; and reporting by means of detailed description using narrative vignettes and direct quotes, as well as analytic charts, summary tables and descriptive statistics. This approach allowed for thorough reflection in noticing and describing everyday events in the field setting and in attempting to identify the significance of actions in the events from the various points of view of the actors themselves.

A deliberate decision was made not to use more traditional methodologies in this project. The tried-and-true methodologies and research designs used most widely in educational research have failed to answer pressing questions, particularly from the perspective of teachers themselves. Experimental and correlational approaches that isolate variables from context and overlook the dimensions of meaning in human behavior have been overworked.

> The experimental strategy has only limited ability to detect interactions . . . The two scientific disciplines, experimental control and systematic correlation, answer formal questions stated in advance . . . The special task of the social scientist in each generation is to pin down the contemporary facts.
>
> (Spindler, 1982: 3-4)

Procedures

Before beginning the fieldwork research, certain entry steps were taken. A meeting with the principal of the school was arranged, at which time an abstract of the proposal was presented. An informal discussion of the innovations at Chauncey and the intent and design of the project itself ensued. The principal indicated his willingness to particpate in the study.

Secondly, the overall proposal was presented to the staff. Emphasis was placed on the positive reasons for choosing Chauncey as a site and on the procedures that would take place as the data was collected. None of the teachers voiced objection to the study, but rather asked questions about the purpose and design of the project. They then indicated their support for the research.

Participant observational fieldwork commenced following the completion of the entry steps. On site visits were scheduled once a week for 5 hours over the course of the academic year (September - June). Data collection began with both the recording of formal observational fieldnotes in the classrooms and informal observations of miscellaneous interactions and occurrences in such places as the cafeteria, playground, teacher's lounge and hallways. Emphasis was put on identifying role relationships and collecting recurrent instances of events across a wide range of situations in the setting. Maps of the classrooms were drawn during the first classroom observations to identify location of the teacher's desk, the physical arrangement of the room for students, and the

work centers, materials and wall displays.

With increased time in the school and consequent familiarity, the general guiding questions were further refined and focused. As Erickson (1984:51) states,

> The fieldworker generates a situation-based inquiry process, learning, through time, to ask questions of the field setting in such a way that the setting, by its answers, teaches the next situationally appropriate questions to ask.

Following classroom observations over a period of approximately 3 months, individual interviews were scheduled with the teachers. The following questions served to guide these interviews:

1. How do you describe your method of teaching? Your instructional style?
2. What is the main role of the teacher, as you see it?
3. What are your goals for this group of students this year?
4. What do you consider the most important components of the curriculum?
5. How do you continue to develop as a teacher?
6. How does the administration facilitate your development as a teacher?
7. What part do teachers play in the school decision-making process?

8. In what ways has your teaching style changed over the years?
9. Chauncey seems to have a variety of teaching modes and philosophies represented. Comment.
10. Social background information on teacher

Several interviews were also arranged with the principal to address such areas as management style, philosophy, perception of the school situation and teacher involvement. Informal interviews with the school secretary, janitor and cooks, as well as with teacher assistants and students were also conducted. To go beyond the school to the broader context, interviews were arranged with parents of children attending Chauncey, as well as with upper level administratos, including the district superintendent and curriculum coordinator. These interviews led to evidence about the relationship of the school to the broader social context of the immediate community and the school system. Parent informants provided information on ethnic and social class factors operating in the town of Chauncey, as the larger social unit of which the school is a part. A portion of the interviews were audiotaped, depending upon the researcher's estimate of the willingness and comfort of the informants. Group interviews of the teachers were also scheduled and tape recorded.

Data Analysis

An analysis of the recorded fieldnotes and interviews began to identify some confirming evidence for the framing of

certain propositions about the inner workings of this elementary school. The results are presented from the perspective of the different components of the system.

1. Principal

This leader sees his overall goal as an administrator to create a comfortable atmosphere for teachers. He works toward this goal by giving them a voice in selecting and hiring new staff and by allowing them to interpret curriculum as each desires. When there are job openings, the teachers are active in selecting the new teachers. "This way they make the decision with me and share the problems and/or good results."

The principal's analysis of the "innovations" at Chauncey provides additonal insight into his perception of his role in relation to the teachers.

> I don't label what they're doing in the primary wing open education or anything; but they (teachers) do. I see it as different teachers with different philosophies in the same building. They are free to try new things. Some believe kids should have more responsibility. New teachers, however, can't do this model. They usually need more structure.

In response to the question of how the "innovations" in the primary wing got started, the principal identified two teachers who he felt had initiated the model. Then, through hiring

procedures, they brought in others who shared a similar philosophy. He stated that he did not like teachers who espouse the new philosophy pressuring other teachers. Every teacher should be allowed to develop his or her own model. "Every kid is different -- the model is probably not good for every kid."

The principal conducts staff meetings twice a month, but doesn't have any one philosophy promoted more than another in these meetings. He believes he's developing leaders by allowing teachers to have major decision-making power. "I have leader-type teachers here!"

In identifying his leadership style, the principal says he manages by walking around. He appears to be a situational decision maker; he believes in being available so that he can be in touch with what's going on. "I'm in control, but not in charge."

Overall, the principal clearly identifies his most important task as that of hiring teachers.

2. Teachers

The primary wing teachers at Chauncey represent different philosophies of education and teaching.

A. Three teachers, in particular, seem to represent an open classroom model of teaching. Interviews of these teachers along with observations of their classrooms show the following elements:

1. Room arrangements are open and less rigid. The teacher's desk is not the focal point.

2. Children make many decisions about how and

when to do things. Children are doing different things at any one point in time.

3. The noise level is higher. There is always a busy hum of activity.

4. The teacher functions as a facilitator throughout the classroom.

5. Group decision-making is operative; many open-ended questions are asked.

6. The teacher's time is spent on the affective domain and interpersonal communication to a great extent, along with academic or curricular matters.

7. Children are encouraged to handle their own disagreements.

In discussing the "innovations" in the primary wing with these three teachers, the initial talk focused on the principal and his style.

> He allows teachers to grow, to develop their own philosophies. There were times when I felt that he wasn't providing enough leadership, that it was a cop out! But I now feel that he tolerates differences in style and allows teachers to develop into leaders. That is why we have gone ahead and tried new things, written the grants and advocated for the discontinuance of the basal readers. We knew he would support our efforts.

The researcher shared her observation with these three

teachers that they appeared to be the most motivated to go after things on their own. The generated discussion focused on their feelings of effectiveness and power in the situation.

> Once we began to identify more clearly what children need and how they learn best, we began looking for ways to go after it. The support group at the University has been very helpful in all of our searching for new methods and rationales for the methods. One success seemed to lead to another. We felt good about getting the grant for peer observation and decided to go after one for a literature-based reading program. This is what teaching is all about! Meeting the needs of children and feeling like you're making a difference!

Continued discussion centered on the meaning of the classroom models they were implementing. The researcher shared her thought that they seemed to be giving children a lot of autonomy and decision-making power.

> I think we believe that our job is to make children independent - - to allow them to be responsibile for themselves. We like it when we can exert some control over our lives; so do kids! The educational system doesn't serve kids well when it adheres to a rigid structure. Kids can't breathe; they can't develop. We feel that an open classroom model promotes decision making and choice. That's what they're

faced with in the real world.

B. Two other primary wing teachers seemed to fall somewhere between an open and traditional model. Observations of their classrooms showed the following:

1. Lower noise level, but quiet not expected
2. Teacher directions to whole group; whole group does same activity.
3. Willingness to deal at length with social-emotional issues
4. Informal atmosphere

In talking with these two teachers, they seemed to espouse the same philosophies as the first three herein described, but their classrooms didn't appear to go as far in the direction of the open classroom model. One teacher indicated:

> I like giving children more freedom, more control, but I believe in structure at times. They (referring to the three teachers who have been the driving force behind the innovations) have really good ideas, and I support their efforts. I like the in-service meetings they have organized for the teachers.

Neither of these two teachers talked as if they were an active part of the process to change things at their school. While they had no objections to the new ideas being presented, they appeared to be more passive participants. Their description of the principal's leadership style held a

slightly different interpretation:

> I like his way of letting us do our own thing, but sometimes I wish there were more structure. He's always available, but he doesn't give much direction!

C. Two other teachers represent more traditional models of education and instruction. The following descriptions fit their classrooms:

1. More formal classroom atmosphere
2. Teacher/student roles clearly defined
3. Teacher and her desk are central; children rely on teacher most of the time
4. Activities done by the whole group at same time
5. Few choices for children; teacher plans and directs

These two teachers describe the situation at Chauncey from a more reserved position.

> She (other teacher) and I represent more structured models. We are older; I guess that's partly the reason - - although I just believe that kids need more structure and organization. There are a number of different philosophies represented here; I'm glad you're looking at all of them. I think part of it is that we see children differently. Some teachers believe children are totally adaptable; therefore, they can adjust to going from an open second grade to a structured third grade. Other teachers believe there should be more internal philosophical con-

> sistency within a building. I guess I wish our leader would provide more direction. But then there are some advantages to his hands-off attitude. We aren't forced to attend numerous one-shot in-service meetings. Rather we frequently come up with our own topics and invite people and it's more meaningful that way. The disadvantage to his style hits areas like the playground. We don't all agree on the rules that should prevail out there. The open classroom teachers feel that the children can generate meaningful rules; I'm not so sure!

D. In interviews with the district curriculum coordinator and superintendent, the researcher gleaned information which reflected their perspective. Both felt that the innovations were largely due to the principal and the type of teachers he hires:

> He is very laid back, non-ego involved; he hires good teachers, has a certain philosophy; and he works very well with children. He chooses a rather non-conformist staff, although he is a very traditional man. He hires strong people who are willing to work hard - - who will carry a load.

The curriculum coordinator sees the innovations as a "bottom-up" acitivity - - the teachers want the program. She voiced support of the changes, but has had no direct role in bringing them about. She feels that in some ways the goals of an open education program contradict the learning objectives approach supported, in general,

by the district.

> More parents need to be involved to receive correct information and serve as a support group. The district has received several complaints; parents have called about the lack of structure in that wing, and the noise, disruption and lack of on-task behavior. Generally speaking, I feel that the innovations are a 60's or 70's phenomena. It probably couldn't have happened at the other elementary schools because of tighter control.

E. Twelve parents were interviewed about the innovations in in the primary wing. Ten of the parents had children in the open classroom models; two were parents of children in the more traditional classrooms. In general, there appeared to be mixed feelings and opinions about the changes:

> Well, my son likes school a lot better this year. I don't have to force him to go. But he doesn't seem to be learning as much; there's not as much work. The teacher seems real nice and he likes her. But, she doesn't always seem to be able to control them.
>
> It's kind of weird that she lets him read his wrestling magazine in school. Don't we pay taxes for those reading books? But he likes her, I can tell you that. He always wants to go and talks about what they do. The room seems pretty noisy to me when I've been in there. That's probably not good!

I'm glad my daughter is with Mrs. _____. I've heard some bad things about those other rooms - - too noisy, no control, magazines. School should be school. They can have fun at home!

She's really turned him on to reading. He brings a lot of those little books home! I like him being in there. But I worry if he's learning the basic stuff - - you know, math and writing. I guess I should feel good if he's happy. He's never been a real good student.

I can tell things are different now. My older son went here, and he didn't do the same stuff. I don't know what I think about it. My daughter seems to like it better than he did; but then she's different, I guess. Seems like it's more fun or something. She talks about Mrs. _____ all the time and what they did.

I'm the one who called the principal; I didn't think there was enough learning going on. I mean, school's supposed to teach things. Mrs. _____ was doing a bunch of other stuff that wasn't work. But I did come in and observe when she asked me to. I saw the kids talking back a lot; that's not right! But they seemed to like the reading things, and my

son is reading pretty good. I'm not sure now. There are some good things and some bad things to what she's doing.

The principal verbalized what he thought the problems were in relation to the parents.

> Chauncey parents have specific ideas of what a teacher should be and do - - the open classroom model seems contradictory. Maybe it's that their homes function in contrast to the philosophy.

Discussion/Implications

An ethnographic account of Chauncey Elementary School provides some insight into the interrelationships within this school and thei relationship to teacher empowerment and teacher efficacy. Such an account, however, does not permit a unidimensional analysis. Although the school from an external perspective is becoming known as the one experimenting with new models and materials, internally such experimentation is associated with only a segment of the faculty. Thus, the implications of the data which describe elements of the school have to be linked to particular groups in order to interpret the apparent interrelationships and their meaning

First, the principal at this elementary school is certainly instrumental with respect to the changes that have occurred. Because of his hands-off attitude, teachers are allowed to try new things and experiment with change. He supports the active involvement of teachers, not necessarily through direct promotion of such involvement, but by allowing them to be responsible for

major parts of the school operation. The teachers are given the freedom to design curriculum, to assist in the hiring of new teachers and to develop grant programs and in-service training opportunities. For each of the faculty segments, however, this modus operandi is seen and interpreted differently. And these perceptions and interpretations are what link directly to teacher efficacy and empowerment.

For the group of teachers in the primary wing described under Section A of this paper, the principal's style gives them the wide-open opportunity to be the active change agents they wish to be. These three teachers appear to be the more autonomous, independent and secure. They have assertively gone after money to implement the kinds of activities and programs they wish to have for young children. Their direct link to the area University and its Institute for Democratic Education gives them the necessary support in articulating their philosophies and models. Their commitment to the open classroom model and its teaching and learning strategies causes them to be highly visible and communicative during the interviewing/hiring process of new teachers. According to the principal, they have been the most active and consistent faculty in attendance at hiring meetings. Other staff have not given as much time to the process and, therefore, do not impact as much on the type of new faculty hired.

In their classrooms, these three teachers implement models whic empower children in much the same way as they are being empowered. They allow for meaningful decision making, choice and responsibility for self in their classrooms. They believe that the affective domai

is as important as the cognitive domain when it comes to education. Children need to feel that they have some control over their lives, that they can effect change, that they are an important part of the entity called school. In interviews with these three teachers, two of them indicated that they came to work at Chauncey from other schools within the district because it appeared to them to offer the opportunity to have some control over what was happening in their classrooms. They had heard that the leadership style in this elementary school allowed teachers to feel an essential part of the organization and, thus, to effect change. Within this environment, these teachers have played a major role in defining and facilitating their own professional development. It would seem to be an example of the Carnegie Foundation's call for "authority to be grounded in the professional competence of the teacher."

For the second group of teachers described under Section B, the same interpretation cannot be given. These two teachers do not seem to be threatened by the changes and innovations initiated by the other three, but they do not take an assertive role in the process. During their interviews, a certain ambivalence was apparent. They seemed less secure about giving children so much choice or power and frequently talked about structure and limits. Yet, they voted in favor of discontinuance of the basal readers and said it was more stimulating to work in a school environment where real issues were being discussed. The noted ambivalence was also present when they discussed the principal. They enjoyed the resultant freedom,

yet desired more structure or intervention at times.

The third group of teachers (Section C) was far less supportive of the changes taking place at Chauncey. They seemed reluctant to be overtly critical of the three teachers who had instigated the changes, but they presented and defended their own views. Their views of children's needs differed dramatically from the first three teachers. They felt that it was the teacher's job to define what and how children should learn.

Interestingly, they were the most critical of the principal's leadership style. They definitely felt he was too laissez-faire and should take a more active role in defining curriculum, rules and regulations, in-service programs and staff make-up.

Summary

Overall, there appeared to be a certain excitement about teaching and learning at Chauncey Elementary School. The actions of a few teachers on the faculty precipitated a lot of discussion and exchange, as well as tangible changes in the classrooms. This school did not appear to fit the descriptor of "flat tone" that Goodlad used to describe many of the school environments he visited.

It would seem accurate to conclude that some teachers in this organization had empowered themselves and caused things to happen. They were the self-motivated ones who thrived on the freedom to create, design, and win or fail. Their principal allowed these teachers to be responsible for themselves. Other

teachers, however, probably needed more direct encouragement and support from their leader. Empowering would appear to be an individually designed strategy that should be integrated into each teacher's personal framework. Many of the teachers at Chauncey were not comfortable with such an open, unstructured approach; but they might begin to effect change and take more control if they were given the guidance they need to begin doing so.

In the final analysis, there are several questions to be answered that only time will tell:

1. Will the three, more assertive teachers in the primary wing continue to exercise as much control over hiring processes, staff development programs, etc.? Or will some of the more traditional teachers begin to take a more active role in these matters?
2. Will the school move toward a more homogeneous philosophy of education through the discussion and exchange process that has been initiated?
3. Will the principal be pushed to take a more active role in defining internal operations, either from parents, upper-level administration or more traditional faculty members?
4. Is it possible for school-based empowerment to work where everyone involved does not have a common set of values and goals?

According to Scott Thomson, executive director of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, ". . .the

first step for school improvement is to create goals and working conditions agreed upon by principals and teachers. Attention must be devoted to finding and supporting common values. Group commitment must be made to new performance norms as they evolve in the organization." Will Chauncey Elementary School be able to work in this direction?

References

Adler, Mortimer J. (1982). The Paideia Proposal. New York: Macmillan.

Ashton, Patricia & Webb, Rodman B. (1986). Making a Difference. New York: Longman, Inc.

Bell, Bernard Iddings (1949). Crisis in Education. New York: Whittlesey House.

Bestor, Arthur (1953). Educational Wastelands. Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Boyer, Ernest L. (1983). High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. New York: Harper and Row.

"Carnegie Forum's task force on teaching as a profession." (1986, May 21). The Chronicle on Higher Education. 44-56.

Education Equality Project. (1983, May). "Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do." New Jersey: The College Board.

Erickson, Frederick. (1984). What Makes School Ethnography Ethnographic? Anthropology and Education Quarterly. Vol. IV, No. 2.

Erickson, Frederick (1984). "Qualitative Methods in Research on Teaching." Occasional Paper No. 81. Institute for Research on Teaching. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

Flesch, Rudolf Franz (1955). Why Johnny Can't Read. New York: Harper.

Goodlad, John (1984). A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983, April). "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform." US Department of Education.

Rickover, H.G. (1959). Education and Freedom. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc.

Silberman, Charles (1970). Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House.

Sizer, Theodore (1984). Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Spindler, George (1982). Doing the Ethnography of Schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Task Force on Education for Economic Growth (1983, May). "Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve our Nation's Schools." Education Commission of the States.

Thomson, Scott (1988). Empowerment of Schools. (Editorial) Monthly Newsletter, National Association of Secondary School Principals.